

Decision _____

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Application of Southern California Edison Company (U338E) for Authority to, Among Other Things, Increase Its Authorized Revenues for Santa Catalina Island Water Operations, and to Reflect That Increase In Rates.	Application 10-11-009 (Filed on November 15, 2010)
---	---

**DECISION GRANTING COMPENSATION TO THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK
FOR SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION TO DECISION 14-10-048**

Intervenor: The Utility Reform Network (TURN)	For contribution to Decision (D.) 14-10-048
Claimed: \$87,363.70	Awarded: \$87,422.45
Assigned Commissioner: Michael Picker	Assigned ALJ: ALJ Division ¹

PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES

A. Brief description of Decision:	Decision (D.) 14-10-048 resolves Southern California Edison Company's (SCE) general rate case for its water utility operations on Santa Catalina Island. The decision adopted two settlements joined by all active parties in the proceeding. The first settlement addressed the revenue requirement issues, adopting a proposed \$4.130 million annual revenue requirement, which is an increase of \$288,000 over the present rate revenues. The settlement was achieved by providing for a one-time transfer of \$8.895 million from SCE's electric customers to permit recovery of rate base investment, and a disallowance of \$2.485 million. The second settlement addressed revenue allocation and rate design issues.
--	--

¹ This proceeding was originally assigned to Linda Rochester, who has since retired.

B. Intervenor must satisfy intervenor compensation requirements set forth in Pub. Util. Code §§ 1801-1812:

	Intervenor	CPUC Verified
Timely filing of notice of intent to claim compensation (NOI) (§ 1804(a)):		
1. Date of Prehearing Conference (PHC):	1/14/11	Verified
2. Other specified date for NOI:		
3. Date NOI filed:	9/16/11 (See note 1, below)	Verified
4. Was the NOI timely filed?		Yes
Showing of customer or customer-related status (§ 1802(b)):		
5. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	P.10-08-016 (Petition re: Mobile Home Parks) (see Note #2)	Verified
6. Date of ALJ ruling:	11/22/10	Verified
7. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):		
8. Has the Intervenor demonstrated customer or customer-related status?		Yes
Showing of “significant financial hardship” (§ 1802(g)):		
9. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	P.10-08-016 (Petition re: Mobile Home Parks) (see Note #2)	Verified
10. Date of ALJ ruling:	11/22/10	Verified
11. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):		
12. Has the Intervenor demonstrated significant financial hardship?		Yes
Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)):		
13. Identify Final Decision:	D.14-10-048	Verified
14. Date of issuance of Final Order or Decision:	10/20/14	Verified
15. File date of compensation request:	12/18/14	Verified
16. Was the request for compensation timely?		Yes

C. Additional Comments on Part I:

#	Intervenor’s Comment(s)	CPUC Discussion
1	On April 22, 2011, TURN filed a motion to intervene, several months after the initial prehearing conference was conducted. Where, as here, the party becomes active after the initial	The Commission agrees with TURN’s assertion.

	<p>prehearing conference, the rules do not set a clear deadline for the NOI. TURN filed its NOI within 30 days from the last day of evidentiary hearings, and submits that this is a reasonable approach under the circumstances.</p> <p>On February 2, 2012, ALJ Barnett issued a ruling granting TURN's motion to intervene. However, to TURN's knowledge no ruling issued on TURN's NOI.</p>	
2	<p>The Commission has consistently found TURN eligible for intervenor compensation throughout the course of this proceeding. <i>See</i> rulings in R.11-11-008 (issued 1/3/12), and A.12-11-009 (issued 9/6/13).</p>	<p>The Commission agrees with TURN's assertion.</p>

PART II: SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION

A. Did the Intervenor substantially contribute to the final decision (*see* § 1802(i), § 1803(a), and D.98-04-059).

Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)	Specific References to Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)	CPUC Discussion
<p>1. Settlement of Revenue Requirement Issues: TURN worked with the other active parties in the proceeding (SCE, ORA and Protestants) to craft a settlement of the revenue requirement issues that would not only achieve an equitable outcome but also serve to avoid the risk of ongoing litigation. Through the joint efforts of the parties, a comprehensive revenue requirement was presented for the Commission's consideration and, ultimately, approval. The original litigation positions of the parties called for the financial impact of SCE's requested revenue requirement increase to be borne by other interests. The settlement position allocated the impact between SCE (which incurred disallowance of \$2.485 million of its already-recorded capital expenditures), Catalina water utility customers (who saw a 7.5% revenue requirement increase on top of water rates that are already among the highest) and SCE electric customers (who will bear a one-time cost in recognition of the water affordability issues on Santa Catalina Island).</p> <p>Due to the confidential treatment of settlement negotiations, TURN is not in a position to identify with specificity the give and take that occurred among the parties in order to achieve</p>	<p>TURN Exhibit 1 (Testimony of William Marcus).</p> <p>Joint Motion of SCE, Protestants, TURN and DRA for Adoption of Settlement (August 16, 2013), pp. 7-11 (Summary of Settlement) and attached Settlement Agreement.</p> <p>D.14-10-048, pp. 2-4 and 10, and Finding of Fact 4 and Conclusion of Law 6 (see also Appendix A, comparing the parties' respective litigation positions with the settlement outcome).</p>	<p>TURN's participation in the successful negotiation of the all-party settlement constitutes a substantial contribution to D.14-10-048.</p>

<p>the final settlement. However, TURN can say with confidence that these were some of the more challenging settlement discussions in which we have participated, as all parties had deeply-held convictions regarding their respective positions and some of the issues were particularly difficult in a manner that would achieve a reasonable outcome while still satisfying each of the parties. And TURN can also acknowledge now that at the time the settlement discussions the gaps between the parties' positions made it appear unlikely that a broad settlement with all-party support could be achieved. The fact that such a settlement was achieved, and the fact that the Commission adopted the proposed settlement without change, firmly establishes that TURN's work toward achieving that settlement is a substantial contribution to D.14-10-048.</p>		
<p>2. Treatment of A&G Allocation:</p> <p>Prior to the settlement, one of the issues addressed in TURN's testimony was the need for three adjustments to the allocation base for purposes of calculating the appropriate A&G allocation to SCE's Catalina water utility operations under the four-factor allocation method. SCE agreed with TURN's position, and the result was a \$100,000 reduction to the annual revenue requirement sought by SCE.</p> <p>The ultimate outcome on this issue was subsumed in the comprehensive settlement of revenue requirement issues. TURN identifies it here for purposes of underscoring the types of substantial contributions that existed independent of the settlement.</p>	<p>TURN Exhibit 1 (Testimony of William Marcus), pp. 6-7.</p> <p>SCE Exhibit 4 (Rebuttal Testimony), pp. 16-17.</p>	<p>Agree.</p>
<p>3. Treatment of Catalina Water SCADA System:</p> <p>Prior to the settlement, one of the issues addressed in TURN's testimony was the reasonableness of SCE's expenditure of approximately \$2.2 million on a Supervisory Control And Data Acquisition (SCADA) system for its water utility operations, since it</p>	<p>TURN Exhibit 1 (Testimony of William Marcus), pp. 9-10.</p>	<p>Agree.</p>

<p>represented a cost of approximately \$1,200 per water customer on Catalina Island for a system that largely monitored water flows.</p> <p>The original Proposed Decision of ALJ Barnett (preceding the all-party settlement) would have found the project unreasonable and denied the capital expenditure in its entirety. (The revised Proposed Decision of ALJ Barnett would have permitted rate recovery for only \$500,000 of the total capital expenditure.)</p> <p>The ultimate outcome on this issue was subsumed in the comprehensive settlement of revenue requirement issues. TURN identifies it here for purposes of underscoring the types of substantial contributions that existed independent of the settlement.</p>	<p>Proposed Decision of ALJ Barnett (April 23, 2012), pp. 30-35.</p>	
<p>4. Settlement of Revenue Allocation and Rate Design Issues:</p> <p>TURN worked with the other active parties in the proceeding (SCE, ORA and Protestants) to craft a settlement of the revenue allocation and rate design issues. This was particularly challenging due to the variance that had developed over the years between the historical water usage levels of Catalina's residents and the lower percentage of total water utility costs borne by those customers as compared to non-residential customers. The discussions also involved thorny questions around setting seasonal rates. Through the joint efforts of the parties, a comprehensive revenue allocation and rate design package was presented for the Commission's consideration and, ultimately, approval.</p>	<p>Joint Motion of SCE, Protestants, TURN and DRA for Adoption of Rate Design and Revenue Allocation Settlement (December 12, 2011).</p> <p>D.14-10-048, pp. 5-6 and 10, and Finding of Fact 4 and Conclusion of Law 6 (see also Appendix D, comparing average monthly bills under current rates with bills under settlement outcomes).</p>	<p>Agree.</p>

B. Duplication of Effort (§ 1801.3(f) and § 1802.5):

	Intervenor's Assertion	CPUC Discussion
a. Was the Office of Ratepayer Advocates (ORA) a party to the proceeding?²	Yes	Yes
b. Were there other parties to the proceeding with positions similar to yours?	Yes	Yes
c. If so, provide name of other parties: The Protestants (a coalition of the City of Avalon, the Chamber of Commerce, the island's principal land owners, condominium associations, and campgrounds) had positions similar to TURN on issues limited to proposed		Yes
<p>d. Intervenor's claim of non-duplication: This was an unusual proceeding, in that the non-utility parties shared some positions in common while having substantial differences on others. For example, TURN's review of SCE's requested revenue requirement concluded that SCE was seeking too large an increase, which put TURN's position on those issues closer to the Protestants' rather than ORA (which sought a smaller reduction to the revenue requirement increase). But to the extent the Protestants supported SCE's alternative proposal to mitigate rate impacts on Catalina water utility customers by transferring amounts to SCE's electric utility customers, TURN and ORA were very closely aligned in first opposing the proposal, and then seeking ways to pursue it on a one-time, non-precedential basis. And once the parties had achieved proposed settlements of both the revenue requirement and revenue allocation/rate design issues, all parties (including SCE) had common positions that they pursued through submission of the settlement for the Commission's consideration and addressing the alternative approach proposed in Commissioner Sandoval's Alternate Proposed Decision.</p> <p>Throughout the course of the proceeding, TURN sought to coordinate closely with ORA and the other parties to ensure an effective presentation on this issue. Given the unusual course this proceeding followed, and particularly the parties' collective ability to resolve their differences and present the Commission with all-party settlements covering both revenue requirement and revenue allocation/rate design issues, TURN submits that the Commission should conclude that the degree of duplication that occurred was reasonable and largely unavoidable under the circumstances.</p> <p>In sum, the Commission should find that TURN's participation was efficiently coordinated with the participation of other intervenors during the phase in which the intervenors had common positions, so as to avoid undue duplication and to ensure that any such duplication served to supplement, complement, or contribute to the showing of the other intervenors.</p>		Agree

² The Division of Ratepayer Advocates was renamed the Office of Ratepayer Advocates effective September 26, 2013, pursuant to Senate Bill No. 96 (Budget Act of 2013: public resources), which was approved by the Governor on September 26, 2013.

PART III: REASONABLENESS OF REQUESTED COMPENSATION**A. General Claim of Reasonableness (§ 1801 and § 1806):**

a. Intervenor's claim of cost reasonableness:	CPUC Discussion
<p>TURN's request for intervenor compensation seeks an award of approximately \$87,000 as the reasonable cost of our participation in the proceeding. In light of the quality of TURN's work, the scope of the proceeding (covering the equivalent of Phase 1 and Phase 2 issues for an energy GRC) and the four-year period over which the matter was litigated, the Commission should have little trouble concluding that the amount requested is reasonable.</p> <p>SCE's application sought an 85% increase to the revenue requirement for its water utility operations on Santa Catalina Island. It also raised challenging revenue allocation and rate design issues in order to achieve a better balance between the level of water consumption and the share of total revenues between Catalina's residential and business customers. TURN's participation helped to mitigate the revenue requirement increase, and to ensure a fair outcome of revenue allocation and rate design issues.</p> <p>In sum, the Commission should conclude that TURN's overall request is reasonable given the issues at stake in the SCE application.</p>	Agree
<p>b. Reasonableness of hours claimed:</p> <p>Over the four-year course of this proceeding, there were two years of relatively high activity (2011 and 2013), and two years of lesser levels of activity (2012 and 2014). In 2011, TURN's two attorneys recorded approximately 100 total hours in this proceeding, or approximately three weeks of full-time work. This work covered preparation of direct testimony on revenue requirement issues, preparing for and participating in two days of evidentiary hearings on those issues, and participating in settlement discussions on revenue allocation and rate design issues. In 2013, the two attorneys recorded less than 40 total hours, or just over one week of full-time work, which was mostly work focused on settlement negotiations on the revenue requirement issues. In 2012 and 2014, TURN's attorneys recorded 23 and 17.5 hours, respectively, or the equivalent of 2-4 total days. In each of those years, TURN's efforts focused largely on addressing proposed decisions, first the proposed decision of ALJ Barnett (and the settlement discussions that began at the Commission's urging in mid-2012), then the proposed decision adopting the all-party settlement.</p> <p>As described below and as further reflected in the time records attached to this request, the number of hours for each TURN representative was reasonable under the circumstances present here.</p> <p><u>TURN Attorneys and Consultants:</u></p> <p>Christine Mailloux served as TURN's lead representative during much of this</p>	Agree

proceeding, with assistance from Robert Finkelstein throughout. Ms. Mailloux took the lead in preparing TURN's direct testimony, representing TURN at the evidentiary hearings and in the settlement discussions on revenue allocation and rate design issues. Mr. Finkelstein provided back-up and assistance throughout the proceeding, taking advantage of his greater experience with energy utility GRCs. He played a more prominent role in the negotiation of the revenue requirement settlement and in the advocacy before the Commission urging the adoption of that settlement. Thomas Long recorded less than an hour to this case, for consultation in his role as TURN's Legal Director when the Alternate Proposed Decision of Commissioner Sandoval issued in 2014. William Marcus of JBS Energy, Inc., served as TURN's expert witness in the proceeding, with support of John Sugar of the firm in performing some of the data analysis and testimony drafting prior to submission of the prepared testimony. Mr. Marcus also played a consultative role throughout the settlement discussions in the proceeding.

TURN submits that the Commission should find reasonable the number of hours for Ms. Mailloux, Mr. Finkelstein, Mr. Long, Mr. Marcus and Mr. Sugar that are included in the request.

Compensation Request Preparation Time: TURN is requesting compensation for 8.0 hours devoted to compensation-related matters, primarily preparation of this request for compensation (7.0 hours). This is a very small number of hours for preparing a compensation request, particularly for a proceeding with time records that extend over nearly four years. The Commission should find it a reasonable figure.

Mr. Finkelstein prepared this request for compensation because his knowledge of all aspects of this proceeding, combined with his experience with the Commission's intervenor compensation program, enable him to prepare the request in a more efficient manner than if it were prepared by one of the other attorneys. In addition, the request for compensation is due during a period when TURN's attorney ranks are temporarily depleted, so assigning the preparation work to Ms. Mailloux or another attorney with a lower hourly rate was not an option.

In sum, the Commission should find that the number of hours claimed is fully reasonable in light of the complexity of the issues and TURN's relative success on the merits.

c. Allocation of hours by issue:

TURN has allocated all of our attorney and consultant time by issue area or activity, as evident on our attached timesheets. The following codes relate to specific substantive issue and activity areas addressed by TURN.

Code	Description
GP	General Participation -- work that was essential to effective participation in the case and that would not vary with the number of issues that TURN addresses, for the most part.
RevReq	Work on discovery, testimony preparation and related matters associated with revenue requirement-related issues, including reviewing and commenting on Proposed Decisions of ALJ Barnett (pre-settlement).
GH	Work preparing for and participating in evidentiary hearings conducted on revenue requirement-related issues (pre-settlement)
RA/RD	Work on revenue allocation and rate design related matters, including negotiations of settlement agreement and participation in preparation of settlement-related pleadings submitted to the Commission.
RevReqStl	Work associated with preparation for settlement negotiations, participation in those negotiations, preparation and presentation of settlement-related documents
StlAdpt	Work associated with presentation of settlement, supporting material called for by ALJ, advocacy for adoption
PD	Work associated with commenting on and meetings in support of adoption of the Proposed Decision of ALJ Rochester adopting the proposed settlements.
Comp	Time devoted to compensation-related pleadings

TURN submits that under the circumstances this information should suffice to address the allocation requirement under the Commission's rules. Should the Commission wish to see additional or different information on this point, TURN requests that the Commission so inform TURN and provide a reasonable opportunity for TURN to supplement this showing accordingly.

B. Specific Claim:*

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
Christine Mailloux	2011	62.25	\$390	D.12-03-053	\$24,277.50	62.25	\$390	\$24,277.50
C. Mailloux	2012	9.0	\$420	D.13-11-020	\$3,780.00	9	\$420	\$3,780.00
C. Mailloux	2013	17.75	\$430	D.14-04-021	\$7,632.50	17.75	\$430	\$7,632.50
C. Mailloux	2014	9.25	\$440	Res. ALJ-303 (See Cmmt 2)	\$4,070.00	9.25	\$440	\$4,070.00
Robert Finkelstein	2011	36.0	\$470	D.12-03-024	\$16,920.00	36	\$470	\$16,920.00
R. Finkelstein	2012	14	\$480	D.13-08-022	\$6,720.00	14	\$480	\$6,720.00
R. Finkelstein	2013	20.0	\$490	D.14-05-015	\$9,800.00	20	\$490	\$9,800.00
R. Finkelstein	2014	8.25	\$500	Res. ALJ-303 (See Cmmt 2)	\$4,120.00	8.25	\$505 ³	\$4,166.25
Thomas Long	2014	0.5	\$570	Res. ALJ-303 (See Cmmt 2)	\$285.00	0.5	\$570	\$285.00
William Marcus	2011	5.17	\$250	D.13-05-008	\$1,292.50	5.17	\$250	\$1,292.50
W. Marcus	2012 ⁴	1.33	\$260	D.13-08-022	\$345.80	1.33	\$260	\$345.80
John Sugar	2011	25.13	\$200	D.13-08-022	\$5,026.00	25.13	\$200	\$5,026.00
Subtotal:\$ 84,274.30						Subtotal:\$84,315.55		
INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate	Total \$
C.Mailloux	2011	1.0	\$195	½ of approved 2011 rate	\$195.00	1	\$195	\$195.00
R. Finkelstein	2014	7.0	\$250	½ of requested 2014 rate	\$1,750.00	7	\$252.50	\$1,767.50
Subtotal:\$1,945.00						Subtotal:\$1,962.50		

³ \$505 hourly rate adopted by Decision (D.) 15-05-027.⁴ Mr. Marcus's hourly billing rate for the first two months of 2013 remained at 2012 levels.

PROPOSED DECISION

COSTS				
#	Item	Detail	Amount	Amount
	Photocopying	Copies made of TURN pleadings for service, and of hearing exhibits during evidentiary hearings in Los Angeles	\$62.45	\$62.45
	Postage	Expenses for postage for this proceeding	\$11.68	\$11.68
	Lexis/Nexis	Computerized research costs associated with preparation of TURN's strategy and pleadings for this proceeding	\$347.93	\$347.93
	Travel	Mileage (@ 0.55/mile) and parking for TURN attendance at hearings and meetings in Los Angeles (three round trips from San Diego)	\$451.30	\$451.00
	Hotel	Hotel for attorney attending evidentiary hearings in Los Angeles	\$271.04	\$271.04
Subtotal: \$1,144.40				Subtotal: \$1,144.40
TOTAL REQUEST: \$87,363.70				TOTAL AWARD: \$87,422.45
<p>**We remind all intervenors that Commission staff may audit their records related to the award and that intervenors must make and retain adequate accounting and other documentation to support all claims for intervenor compensation. Intervenors' records should identify specific issues for which it seeks compensation, the actual time spent by each employee or consultant, the applicable hourly rates, fees paid to consultants and any other costs for which compensation was claimed. The records pertaining to an award of compensation shall be retained for at least three years from the date of the final decision making the award.</p> <p>**Travel and Reasonable Claim preparation time typically compensated at ½ of preparer's normal hourly rate</p>				
ATTORNEY INFORMATION				
Attorney	Date Admitted to CA BAR ⁵	Member Number	Actions Affecting Eligibility (Yes/No?) If "Yes", attach explanation	
Christine Mailloux	December 1993	167918	No	
Robert Finkelstein	June 1990	146391	No	
Thomas Long	December 1986	124775	No	

C. Attachments Documenting Specific Claim and Comments on Part III

Attachment or Comment #	Description/Comment
1	Certificate of Service
2	Attorney Time Sheet Detail
3	Expense Detail
4	TURN hours allocated by issue
Comment 1	For 2014 hourly rates TURN is using the recently authorized cost-of-living adjustment of 2.56% adopted in Resolution ALJ-303 applied to the previously authorized rate for each

⁵This information may be obtained through the State Bar of California's website at <http://members.calbar.ca.gov/fal/MemberSearch/QuickSearch>.

	attorney's work in 2013.
Comment 2	Travel expenses – TURN has included in this request expenses associated with our attorney traveling to hearings and meetings that took place in Los Angeles. As the mileage expense claims indicate, the events requiring travel were located 110 and 115 miles from TURN's attorney's home in the San Diego area. The Commission has of late applied a general rule that any travel of 120 miles or less constitutes "routine commuting" and therefore does not compensate for associated time or expenses. TURN seeks an exception to that general rule under the circumstances present here, only as applied to the associated expenses. This was not "routine commuting" in any sense of the word, but rather travel similar to that required when TURN's San Diego-based attorney travels to the Commission's San Francisco office for hearings and events in a proceeding for which she serves as TURN's primary representative. Ms. Mailloux travels to Los Angeles for TURN-related work even less frequently than she travels to San Francisco. The treatment of the reasonable travel-related expenses here should be determined based on the specific circumstances of this proceeding, rather than by application of the general standard that treats any one-way travel of less than 120 miles as "routine commuting" and therefore non-compensable.

PART IV: OPPOSITIONS AND COMMENTS

A. Opposition: Did any party oppose the Claim?	No
B. Comment Period: Was the 30-day comment period waived (<i>see</i> Rule 14.6(c)(6))?	Yes

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. The Utility Reform Network has made a substantial contribution to Decision (D.) 14-10-048.
2. The requested hourly rates for The Utility Reform Network's representatives are comparable to market rates paid to experts and advocates having comparable training and experience and offering similar services.
3. The claimed costs and expenses are reasonable and commensurate with the work performed.
4. The total of reasonable compensation is \$87,422.45.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. The Claim, with any adjustment set forth above, satisfies all requirements of Pub. Util. Code §§ 1801-1812.
2. The comment period should be waived, and today's decision should be made effective immediately, to facilitate prompt payment of the award.

ORDER

1. The Utility Reform Network shall be awarded \$87,422.45.
2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, Southern California Edison Company shall pay The Utility Reform Network the total award. Payment of the award shall include compound interest at the rate earned on prime, three-month non-financial commercial paper as reported in Federal Reserve Statistical Release H.15, beginning March 3, 2015, the 75th day after the filing of The Utility Reform Network's request, and continuing until full payment is made.
3. The comment period for today's decision is waived.
4. This decision is effective today.

Dated _____, at San Francisco, California.

APPENDIX**Compensation Decision Summary Information**

Compensation Decision:		Modifies Decision?	No
Contribution Decision(s):	D1410048		
Proceeding(s):	A1011009		
Author:	ALJ Division		
Payer(s):	Southern California Edison Company		

Intervenor Information

Intervenor	Claim Date	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Multiplier?	Reason Change/Disallowance
The Utility Reform Network (TURN)	12/18/2014	\$87,363.70	\$87,422.45	No	

Advocate Information

First Name	Last Name	Type	Intervenor	Hourly Fee Requested	Year Hourly Fee Requested	Hourly Fee Adopted
Christine	Mailloux	Attorney	TURN	\$390	2011	\$390
Christine	Mailloux	Attorney	TURN	\$420	2012	\$420
Christine	Mailloux	Attorney	TURN	\$430	2013	\$430
Christine	Mailloux	Attorney	TURN	\$440	2014	\$440
Robert	Finkelstein	Attorney	TURN	\$470	2011	\$470
Robert	Finkelstein	Attorney	TURN	\$480	2012	\$480
Robert	Finkelstein	Attorney	TURN	\$490	2013	\$490
Robert	Finkelstein	Attorney	TURN	\$500	2014	\$505
Thomas	Long	Attorney	TURN	\$570	2014	\$570
William	Marcus	Expert	TURN	\$250	2011	\$250
William	Marcus	Expert	TURN	\$260	2012	\$260
John	Sugar	Expert	TURN	\$200	2011	\$200

(END OF APPENDIX)